



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of the subjunctive but completes the cycle of the tense forms of that mood. The subjunctive already has a full complement of present and of past tense-forms. Why should it not be possible to predicate action or state under the subjunctive modifications, in future time as well as in present or in past time? In this we have a most apt analogy in the German—the closest akin of all our cognate languages—which has in the subjunctive mood future tense-forms similar to those which it has in the indicative.

Probably the strongest reasons for classing as future subjunctives the forms in which *would* and *should* appear as auxiliaries, is the practical advantage which it serves. It is an exceedingly convenient classification, both in outlining the conjugations of the verb, and in explaining the more difficult principles of English syntax. After an experience of almost a decade with this method, the writer does not hesitate to say that the constructions for indirect discourse, for conditions contrary-to-fact (unreal conditions), for less vivid future conditions (ideal conditions), and the like, can be made much simpler, and that the co-ordination of these English constructions with similar constructions in German, Latin, and Greek is immensely facilitated, if these forms are classed as future tense-forms of the subjunctive mood.

Is there any good reason why these forms should not be classed as future subjunctive tense-forms? And if not, with the arguments mentioned above in favor of this classification, ought it not to be more generally adopted by the authors of our text-books on English grammar?

E. B. SETZLER.

Newberry College, South Carolina.

---

#### A NOTE ON SHAKESPEARE.

For many years I have felt that the word *rouse*, 'intoxication, a drinking frolic,' which occurs four times in Shakespeare, has not been satisfactorily explained by the annotators or

in most of the dictionaries. The word is common in all the Scandinavian languages in the form *rus*, which means 'a carouse, a fit of intoxication.' For example in Danish, *at tage sig en rus* or *at faa sig en rus*, 'to indulge in a spree'; *at sove rusen ud*, 'to sleep off one's debauch, sleep oneself sober.' The word must have been borrowed from the Danish, as pointed out by Professor Skeat, in whose *Etymological Dictionary* it is correctly explained. In the other dictionaries, except the Shakespearian, *rouse* is defined as meaning a bumper, though Webster adds "a drinking frolic." Schmidt, in his *Shakespeare Lexicon* defines the word as "free and copious drinking, a full measure of liquor"; and Phin in his *Shakespeare Cyclopaedia and New Glossary*, as "a bumper; a copious draft of liquor," referring to *Hamlet*, I, 2, 127; I, 4, 8, and *Othello*, II, 3, 66; and as "a carouse; a drinking feast," referring to *Hamlet*, II, 1, 58. The annotators almost invariably explain the word as meaning simply a 'bumper'; yet in Shakespeare it evidently means the same as in the language from which it was borrowed, at least in three of the four passages. These passages are the following: *Hamlet*, I, 2, 127: "And the king's rouse the heavens shall bruit again"; *Hamlet*, I, 4, 8: "The king doth wake to-night and takes his rouse"; *Hamlet*, II, 1, 58: "There was he gaming, there o'ertook in's rouse"; and *Othello*, II, 3, 66: "'Fore God, they have given me a rouse already."

In all these cases Professor Rolfe explains *rouse* as meaning 'a bumper,' though in the last case he adds "too deep a draft." Professor Dowden in his edition of *Hamlet* makes it 'bumper' in all the four cases. In Dr. Furness's Variorum Edition, where one naturally looks for the best criticism on all Shakespearian questions, there is no intimation that the editor has perceived the true explanation. Under the first case Dr. Furness quotes Wedgwood's antiquated etymology, but does not hint what he thinks the word may mean. Under the second he quotes Gifford's definition of *rouse* as meaning "a large glass in which a health was given." On "o'ertook in's rouse"

he quotes from Clarendon: "That is, by intoxication. One of the many euphemisms for drink," which is the nearest to the truth of all his notes, quoted or original. Under the passage in *Othello* he again quotes Gifford's definition. Phin, Schmidt, and Skeat, whose explanation is the best, are not even mentioned. It seems as if Gifford's definition had fixed the matter for all time in the mind of the annotators and most of the lexicographers. And yet this explanation is manifestly wrong so far as the passages in Shakespeare are concerned, however much the word elsewhere may have the meaning of 'bumper.'

In the first passage, "And the king's rouse the heavens shall bruit again," a very little thought will convince the reader that it is not the king's bumper that is to be bruited, but his draining of it, or rather his drinking or getting drunk, without reference to a single bumper, for we must suppose him to drain several at a sitting. In the second, "The king doth wake to-night and takes his rouse," the meaning is that the king is having his (customary) carouse, *tager sin rus*. In the third passage, "There was he gaming, there o'ertook in's rouse," it is absurd to say that the king or any other man can be overtaken in a bumper, though there is very evident sense in saying that a man may be overtaken in drunkenness. In the passage in *Othello*, "'Fore God, they have given me a rouse already," the word *rouse* might possibly mean a bumper; yet there is not much point in Cassio's saying so. He says in effect, "They have made me intoxicated already." So it appears that in the three passages in which the word is found in *Hamlet* it can mean only one thing, 'a fit of drunkenness, a spree'; and also in the passage in *Othello*, 'intoxication' is the most likely meaning.

In the passages quoted in the dictionaries and in notes to Shakespeare's plays to illustrate the meaning of the word *rouse*, it seems in most cases to have the same meaning as in Shakespeare. The passages I have seen are the following:—

He took his *rouse* with stoups of Rhenish wine,  
from Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*;

Your lord, by his patent,  
Stands bound to take his *rouse*,

from Massinger's *Duke of Milan*, act I, scene 1;

Fill the cup, and fill the can,  
Have a *rouse* before the morn,

from Tennyson's *Vision of Sin*; in all of which the meaning of 'intoxication' is the only possible one.

I have taken, since supper,  
A *rouse* or two too much, and by [the gods],  
It warms the blood,

from Beaumont and Fletcher's *Knight of Malta*, is the only passage I have seen in which the definition of 'bumper' is suitable.

It appears, then, that in English literature generally, and in Shakespeare in particular, the word *rouse* means 'intoxication, a carousal,' and that no other explanation is admissible in Shakespeare.

ALBERT E. EGGE.

Pullman, Washington.

## A NEW PLAY BY JOHN FORD.

### I.

As the thirteenth volume of "Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas," Professor Bang publishes an admirable edition of an old play, *The Queen or the Excellency of Her Sex*, which he attributes to John Ford. The *Queen* has an interesting, though not an illustrious history; it seems to have slept in undisturbed oblivion since 1653, when it was temporarily resuscitated by the actor Alexander Goughe. This Goughe was one of the melancholy survivors of the Last Judgment of 1642. On evil days though fallen, Goughe stuck to his calling, and played his part in those surreptitious and hazardous theatrical performances with which, in the reign of Puritan righteousness, the old lovers of the drama had to content themselves. The congratulatory verses prefixed to the play give vigorous expression to the resentment at the rigor of rulers